

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed August 11, 2004. Claims 1-18 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-18 were rejected. Claims 1-18 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 5 and 8 were objected to by the Examiner. Specifically, the Examiner objects to Claim 5 because the Examiner states that there is no antecedent basis for “each of” relating to the clause “each of said at least one telescopic hinge.” Applicant respectfully submits that a change to Claim 5 is unnecessary for the understanding of Claim 5. Claim 1, from which Claim 5 depends, recites “at least one telescopic hinge.” Claim 5 recites “each of said at least one telescopic hinge being inserted into” Thus, Claim 5 clearly indicates that for each “telescopic hinge” of Claim 1 (e.g., one or more), “each” is inserted into a “recess to couple said lid with said housing.” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 8, the Examiner asserts that there is no antecedent basis for “wherein *at least one segment* of said at least one telescopic hinge.” Applicant respectfully submits that a change to Claim 8 is unnecessary for the understanding of Claim 8. However, Claim 8 has been amended to recite that “at least one segment of said plurality of extensibly coupled segments” Applicant respectfully submits that “at least one segment” clearly refers to at least one of the “plurality of extensibly coupled segments.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection now be withdrawn.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,812,285 issued to Lin et al. (hereinafter "*Lin*"). Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,150,896 issued to Wakeman (hereinafter "*Wakeman*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Of the rejected Claims, Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Independent Claim 1 recites "at least one telescopic hinge operable to couple a lid to said housing," and independent Claim 11 recites "at least two telescopic hinges, each having a plurality of extensible segments." Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Lin* nor *Wakeman* discloses or even suggests the limitations of Claim 1 or Claim 11. For example, by definition, "telescopic" means "to slide inward or outward in overlapping sections, as the cylindrical sections of a small hand telescope do" (American Heritage Dictionary, 3d Edition). In contrast, *Lin* appears to disclose a single support arm extending from the cover 1 of *Lin* into a recess 6 of the main body 2 of the scanner device of *Lin* (*Lin*, figures 2-5). Further, *Wakeman* appears to disclose a single rod 31 extending into a hole 32 in the housing structure 21 of the photographic copying apparatus of *Wakefield* (*Wakefield*, figure 6, column 3, lines 30-59). Therefore, neither *Lin* nor *Wakeman* disclose or even suggest a "telescopic hinge" as recited by Claims 1 and 11.

Claims 2-5, 7-9 and 13-18 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1 and 11 are also not anticipated by either *Lin* or *Wakefield* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1 and 11 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Lin* and *Wakefield*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-5, 7-9 and 13-18 be withdrawn.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wakeman* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,832,937 issued to Moore et al. (hereinafter "*Moore*"). The Examiner also rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wakeman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,157 issued to Duescher (hereinafter "*Duescher*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 10 depends from independent Claim 1, and Claim 12 depends from independent Claim 11. For at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claims 10 and 12 that depend respectively therefrom are also allowable and, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 10 and 12 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James L. Baudino
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: 11-10-04

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884